

REMARKS

At the outset, Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the thorough review and consideration of the present application. The Office Action dated February 4, 2003, has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

In the Office Action dated February 4, 2003, the drawings are objected to as not showing every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Namely, the Office Action states at paragraph 2, “the laser welded connection between the transparent conductive electrode and the common electrode (claims 6 and 16) must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s).” With respect to this objection, Applicant hereby corrects FIGS. 3 and 4 to indicate the laser welding recited by claims 6 and 16. Applicant herewith submits a Request for Approval of Drawing Changes with corrected FIGS. 3 and 4. Applicant also hereby amends the specification to include new reference number 42 to indicate the laser welding.

Claims 1-5, 9, 10, and 11-15, 17, 20, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,452,656 to Niwano et al. (“Niwano”). Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Niwano. Claims 7, 8, 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Niwano in view of the related art disclosed by Applicant (“Related Art”). Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Niwano in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,124,851 to Jacobson.

The rejection of claims 1-5, 9, and 10 is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Claims 1-5, 9, and 10 are allowable over the cited references in that each of these claims recites a combination of elements including, for example, “a transparent conductive film in a layer over the data electrode, the transparent conductive film electrically connected with the common electrode.” None of the cited references, including Niwano, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 and claims 2-5, 9, and 10, which depend from claim 1, are allowable over the cited references.

Claim 6 contains all of the limitations of claim 1, and similarly cannot be anticipated by Niwano. Moreover, Niwano is cited in the Office Action as rendering claim 6 obvious

because “[a]lthough the common electrode is not indicated to be electrically connected with the transparent conductive film through a laser welding process, this limitation does not have patentable weight in the absence of differences between the electrical connection disclosed in Niwano and that produced by laser welding.” Office Action at pp. 4-5. However, as discussed above with respect to claim 1, at least claim 1 and its dependent claims, including claim 6, are patentably distinct over Niwano. Therefore, claim 6 is patentable distinct over Niwano, without reaching the merits of the patentably distinction between “the electrical connection disclosed in Niwano” and laser welding. Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 6 is allowable over the cited references.

Claims 7 and 8 depend from claim 1, and similarly cannot be anticipated by Niwano. The Office Action cites the Related Art cited by the Applicant to cure the deficiencies of Niwano. However, as discussed above, Niwano fails to teach or suggest, for example, “a transparent conductive film in a layer over the data electrode, the transparent conductive film electrically connected with the common electrode.” The Related Art also fails to teach or suggest this feature. Therefore, Applicant submits that claims 7 and 8 are allowable over the cited references.

Similarly, the rejection of claims 11-15, 17, 20 and 21 is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Claims 11-15, 17, 20 and 21 are allowable over the cited references in that each of these claims recites a combination of elements including, for example, “forming a transparent conductive film in a layer over the data electrode, the transparent conductive film electrically connected with the common electrode.” None of the cited references, including Niwano, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 11 and claims 12-15, 17, 20 and 21, which depend from claim 11, are allowable over the cited references.

Claim 16 contains all of the limitations of claim 11, and similarly cannot be anticipated by Niwano. As discussed above with respect to claim 11, at least claim 11 and its dependent claims, including claim 16, are patentably distinct over Niwano. The Office Action cites Jacobson as curing the deficiencies of Niwano. That is, Jacobson does not teach or suggest “forming a transparent conductive film in a layer of the data electrode, the transparent conductive film electrically connected with the common electrodes.” Therefore, claim 16 is patentable distinct over Niwano, without reaching the merits of the patentably distinction

between. Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 16 is allowable over the cited references.

Claims 17 and 18 depend from claim 11, and similarly cannot be anticipated by Niwano. The Office Action cites the Related Art cited by the Applicant to cure the deficiencies of Niwano. However, as discussed above, Niwano fails to teach or suggest, for example, "forming a transparent conductive film in a layer over the data electrode, the transparent conductive film electrically connected with the common electrode." The Related Art also fails to teach or suggest this feature. Therefore, Applicant submits that claims 17 and 18 are allowable over the cited references.

Applicant believes the foregoing remarks and amendments place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue.

Dated: May 5, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Rebecca Goldman Rudich
Registration No.: 41,786
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006

DC:123797.1



30827

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant